

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116, because the amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented, because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 6, 8 and 9 were pending in this application when examined.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite a step of “preparing a solution by dissolving fullerene C₆₀ in a first solvent”; to recite a step of “mixing a solution containing the diethyl ester malonate derivative of C₆₀ with the solution”; and to recite “this mixed solution”. Support for these amendments can be found on page 8, line 4 to page 9, line 26 of the specification.

Claim 2 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 2, 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazawa et al. (US 2002/0192143) in view of Beck et al. (Russian Chemical Bulletin), and further in view of Miyazawa, Masuno and Suga (Electron Microscopy). As applied to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite at least the steps of “preparing a solution by dissolving fullerene C₆₀ in a first solvent, **mixing a solution containing the diethyl ester malonate derivative of C₆₀ with the solution**, adding a second solvent of lower fullerene derivative and fullerene dissolving ability and a first solvent to **this mixed solution**, forming a liquid-liquid interface between the solution and the second solvent, and depositing the fullerene derivative fine wire on the liquid-liquid interface”.

The Examiner states that US 2002/0192143 “teaches a production process for making fullerene and fullerene derivative comprising steps of (1) putting together a solution containing the fullerene dissolved in a first solvent with a second solvent having less solvency for the fullerene than the first solvent; (2) forming a liquid-liquid interface between the solution and the

second solvent; [and] (3) depositing a fine carbon wire at the liquid-liquid” (see the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action).

However, the reference does not disclose or suggest a step of “mixing a solution containing the diethyl ester malonate derivative of C₆₀ with the solution”, as recited in amended claim 6.

The Russia Bulletin and Electron Microscopy references also do not disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, claim 6 would not have been obvious over the references.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 6, and thus also would not have been obvious over the references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

For these reasons, Applicants take the position that the presently claimed invention is clearly patentable over the applied references.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kun'ichi MIYAZAWA et al.

By Andrew B. Freistein/
Digitally signed by /Andrew B. Freistein/
DN: cn=/Andrew B. Freistein/, ou=WLP,
ou=WLP, email=afreistein@wenderoth,
.com, c=US
Date: 2010.08.19 14:27:21 -0400

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicants

ABF/emj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 19, 2010